

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-14, 17 and 19-20 are now pending in this application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 8-14, 17 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as being anticipated by Kobayashi (U.S. Patent No. 6,633,759). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to claim 1, Kobayashi fails to show, teach, or suggest, inter alia, wherein the information about the interface client includes at least information about display capabilities of the interface client. The Examiner cites col. 14, lines 12-15 of Kobayashi as disclosing wherein the information about the interface client includes at least information about display capabilities of the interface client. However, this portion merely discloses that the user of the PC 1 can receive (1) electric field intensity information (e.g., wireless signal strength information) for a wireless link between the cellular phone 2 and the local cellular phone station 3 or (2) battery information of the cellular phone 2. Applicants can find no mention of information about display capabilities of the interface client in the cited portions of Kobayashi.

The Examiner contends that "display capabilities" is not specifically defined in the claim and therefore information about electric field intensity and/or battery life is equivalent to information about display capabilities. Applicants submit that the Examiner's contention is in

clear error. Applicants kindly remind the Examiner that words of the claim must be giving their plain meaning unless the plain meaning is inconsistent with the specification. MPEP 2111.01. As such, the term "display capabilities" must be given its plain meaning. Applicants can find no correlation between signal strength and/or battery life information as disclosed in Kobayashi and display capability information as required by the claim. If this rejection is maintained, Applicants kindly request that the Examiner explain how signal strength and/or battery life information is equivalent to display capabilities of an interface client.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1. Claims 9 and 17 are allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 17 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6, 8, 10-14, 19-20 each ultimately depend on one of claims 1, 9, and 17 and are allowable for at least similar reasons. Claims 2-6, 8, 10-14, 19-20 are also believed to be allowable for having novel and non-obvious subject matter. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-6, 8, 10-14, 19-20 is respectfully requested.

AMENDMENT 11 (RESPONSE TO PAPER NO. 20080317;
OFFICE ACTION DATED MAR. 21, 2008)

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (312) 609-7620.

Respectfully submitted,

VEDDER PRICE P.C.

Date: May 21, 2008

By: 

Mark A. Dalla Valle
Reg. No. 34,147

Attorney for Assignee
222 N. LaSalle St.
Chicago, IL 60601
Telephone: 312-609-7500
Facsimile: 312-609-5005
Customer No.: 23418
Atty. Docket No.: 11602.00.0005